

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-887001/P17697
Intel Corporation

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims and claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection. No new matter has been added.

Double Patenting

It is respectfully requested that the "provisional" double patenting rejection be withdrawn as it is respectfully submitted that the only remaining ground for rejection has been addressed herein.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kalk. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite mechanically clamping a pellicle within an outer pellicle frame and an inner pellicle frame, placing a polymer layer between a reticle and a selected one of the outer pellicle frame and the inner pellicle frame, and heating the polymer layer to a pre-determined temperature to attach the reticle to the selected pellicle frame. For support, see, inter alia, paragraphs 24-26, 36-42, and 52.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-887001/P17697
Intel Corporation

Kalk describes an arrangement in which an adhesive gasket may be placed on a frame associated with a pellicle assembly in contact with a photomask and heating the adhesive gasket to flow and comply with a flatness of the photomask (see, inter alia, Kalk claim 1). There is no suggestion in Kalk to mechanically clamp two pellicle frames together and to heat a polymer layer so that a reticle attaches to one of the pellicle frames. Such an arrangement provides a non-obvious improvement over Kalk in that it permits, inter alia, the frame that is not attached to the reticle to absorb stress or displacement (see, inter alia, specification paragraph 40).

Accordingly, claims 1-17 should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as


Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-887001/P17697
Intel Corporation

specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/3/05



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10536421.doc